

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Applicant is amending claims 1, 10, and 19.

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and the objection to claim 10.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,311,422 (Loftin) in view of “Accounting and Financial Fundamentals for Non Financial Executives” (Rachlin).

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is amending the claim to include the feature of “when the feedback category corresponds to an administrative category and **when an actual amount of work completed by the student is less than an expected amount of work**, instructing the student to provide a sufficient amount of work to assess a subsequent response.” (Emphasis added.) The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed. For example, the specification discloses (Page 14, line 38-39 and page 16, lines 1-10.):

In the ICAT model of feedback, there are four levels of severity of error and four corresponding levels of feedback. The tutor goes through the student's work, identifies the severity of the error and then provides the corresponding level of feedback.

Returning to the analogy of helping someone write a paper, if the student writes on the wrong subject, this is a global error requiring redirect feedback. If the student returns with the paper rewritten, but with many errors in one area of the paper, focus feedback is needed. With all of those errors fixed and only spelling mistakes--syntactic mistakes--polish feedback is needed. When all syntactic mistakes were corrected, the tutor would return praise and restate why the student had written the correct paper. **Focusing on the educational components of completing a task is not enough. As any teacher knows, student will often try and cheat their way through a task. Students may do no work and hope the teacher does not notice or the student may only do minor changes in hope of a hint or part of the answer. To accommodate these administrative functions, there are three additional administrative categories of feedback. The administrative and the educational categories of feedback account for every piece of feedback a designer can write and a student can receive. To provide a better understanding of how the feedback works together, an example is provided below.**

The above teaching discloses providing feedback based on the evaluation of errors in a student's response (e.g., corresponding to the educational categories of feedback including syntactical, local, and global as summarized in the table shown on page 15.) However, the above teaching also discloses that focusing merely on the errors in student's answer (corresponding to the educational categories of feedback) may not be enough when providing feedback to the student. For example, the student may cheat through an exercise, in which the student submits little work or even no work in the hope of obtaining hints from the feedback in order to complete the assignment. Consequently, the present invention provides feedback that includes additional administrative categories.

The Office Action alleges that Loftin discloses (Pages 4-5. Emphasis added.):

... (e) evaluating progress toward the goal (*col. 6, lines 55-59*) and providing a determined feedback having a feedback category (*col. 12, lines 57-65, col. 14, lines 5-6. Examiner interprets diagnose the nature of the error, and sensitive to the skill level of the trainee as feedback category*) based on an appropriate level of feedback (*col. 14, lines 8-9*) and an appropriate training component (*col. 16, lines 31 -43*) that further motivates accomplishment of the accounting goal (*col. 6, lines 55-59*), the appropriate level of feedback being selected from the plurality of feedback levels based on an error severity of an associated response from the student (*col. 11, lines 55-59, col. 12, 15-18, col. 14, lines 8-16*), the appropriate training component being selected from a plurality of training components and based on an amount of work contained in the associated response (*col.16, lines 31-43. Examiner asserts an acceptable level of competence to read on an amount of work*), and further comprising:

(e)(i) determining the type of the feedback category for the associated response (*col. 9, line 67, col. 10, line 1*);

(e)(ii) when the feedback category corresponds to an administrative category, instructing the student to provide a sufficient amount of work to assess a subsequent response (*col. 12, lines 57-65. Examiner asserts diagnose the nature of the error to read on administrative category*); and

(e)(iii) when the feedback category corresponds to an educational category, assessing the associated response in accordance with the educational category (*col. 14, lines 5-6. Examiner asserts sensitive to the skill level of the trainee to read on educational category*); ...

However, Loftin fails to even suggest a type of feedback category that includes an administrative category. For example, Loftin discloses (Column 12, lines 57-65. Emphasis added.):

The present system can detect any erroneous action made by a trainee, and in addition thereto, through the use of the mal-rules, diagnose the nature of the error and provide an error message to the trainee specifically designed to inform the trainee about the exact error made. **Also, the mal-rule aids in correcting the**

misconception or lack of knowledge that led to the commission of any particular error. Thus, the mal-rules aid in diagnosing the nature of an error.


Loftin merely discloses providing feedback by analyzing errors (corresponding to “misconception or lack of knowledge” of the trainee) contained in the response from a trainee; however, Loftin fails to even suggest an administrative category of feedback. Moreover, Rachlin fails to remedy the deficiencies of Loftin. The combination of Loftin and Rachlin fails to suggest the features of “determining the type of the feedback category for the associated response” and “when the feedback category corresponds to an administrative category and when an actual amount of work completed by the student is less than an expected amount of work, instructing the student to provide a sufficient amount of work to assess a subsequent response.”

Independent claim 10 includes similar features of “determining the type of the feedback category for the associated response” and “when the feedback category corresponds to an administrative category and when an actual amount of work completed by the student is less than an expected amount of work, instructing the student to provide a sufficient amount of work to assess a subsequent response.” Also, independent claim 19 includes similar features of “determining the type of the feedback category for the associated response” and “when the feedback category corresponds to an administrative category and when an actual amount of work completed by the student is less than an expected amount of work, instructing the student to provide a sufficient amount of work to assess a subsequent response.” Claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Thus, claims 2-20 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-20.

It is respectfully submitted that the present patent application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 12, 2007


Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001